DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 139 463 JC 770 283

AUTHOR Meisinger, Richard J., Jr.; Riley, Patricia J.
TITLE Community College Academic Program Productivity Study.
INSTITUTION Virginia State Council of Higher Education, Richmond.
PUB DATE 76
NOTE 19p.

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.83 HC-$1.67 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Associate Degrees; Bachelors Degrees; Community Colleges; Doctoral Degrees; Enrollment Rate; *Evaluation Criteria; *Junior Colleges; Masters Degrees; *Post Secondary Education; Productivity; Program Effectiveness; *Program Evaluation; State Boards of Education; *State Standards; Statewide Planning
IDENTIFIERS *Virginia

ABSTRACT

Virginia's Council of Higher Education quantitatively evaluated the productivity of 436 degree programs in 23 community colleges. Programs were reviewed in terms of the average number of degrees conferred each year and on the basis of full-time equivalent enrollment (FTE). Minimum standards by which programs were evaluated included annual production of 10 Associate in Arts (AA)/Associate in Science (AS) degrees or 7 Associate in Applied Science (AAS) degrees per program, and 18 to 22 lower division FTE students in AA/AS degree programs or 13 to 17 lower division FTE students in AAS programs. Special consideration was given to low-productivity interdisciplinary programs, new programs, and programs given special justification by the sponsoring college. As a result of the statewide program review, 45 programs were identified which required additional justification for their continuance; of these, 34 were voluntarily terminated by the Community College Board, five were closed by the Council, five were consolidated into two, and action was deferred in one case. Appended is a separate document issued by the Council, "The Quantitative Evaluation of Degree Programs", setting forth the degree productivity criteria, service criteria, and program evaluation procedures for Associate, Bachelor's, Master's, and Doctoral degree programs. (JDS)

****
* Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished *
* materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort *
* to obtain the best copy available. Nevertheless, items of marginal *
* reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality *
* of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available *
* via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not *
* responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions *
* supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original. *
****

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

COMMONWEALTH of VIRGINIA

DANIEL E. MARVIN, JR.
DIRECTOR

Council of Higher Education

700 Fidelity Building, 9th & Main Streets, Richmond, Virginia 23219

(804) 786-2143

ED139463

MEMORANDUM

MARCH 4, 1976

TO: Members of SHEEO

FROM: Daniel E. Marvin, Jr.

Many states have shown an interest in academic program review procedures, especially ones that focus on quantitative measures of productivity. The State Council of Higher Education for Virginia has recently completed its second such program review. I enclose a copy of the Virginia Community College Academic Program Productivity Study. The study was completed by Dr. Richard J. Meisinger, Jr., Academic Programs Coordinator, and Mrs. Patricia J. Riley, Research Assistant. The study was presented to our Council in February, 1976.

The study of 436 programs in 23 community colleges resulted in the following action: voluntary termination of 34 programs by the Community College Board; closing of five programs by the State Council of Higher Education; combination of five programs into two; and deferral of action on one program. As a result of this study, approximately ten percent of the programs of the Virginia Community College System were eliminated.

Please do not hesitate to contact Dr. Meisinger, Mrs. Riley, or myself if you would like further information about this study.

Enclosure

DEMjr/gkd

JC 770 263

COMMUNITY COLLEGE ACADEMIC PROGRAM PRODUCTIVITY STUDY

I. Reason for the Activity

In 1974, the Council of Higher Education directed its staff to study the quantitative productivity of degree programs, first at the senior institutions and then at the community colleges. In mid-1975, the Joint Legislative Audit and Review Commission (JLARC) recommended that the Council report on degree program productivity by March 31, 1976.

II. Methodology

A. Criteria

The quantitative evaluation of degree programs has followed the policies and procedures developed by the Instructional Programs Advisory Committee and adopted by the Council of Higher Education in April, 1974. The Council has review authority for associate degree programs only; the conferral of diplomas and certificates is under the jurisdiction of the Department of Community Colleges. Consequently, Council-approved criteria were used to judge only the productivity of associate degree programs.

The first phase of the evaluation was an examination of the number of degrees conferred each year and the average per year over a period of several years. Council-approved guidelines call for the following minimal annual average number of graduates:

10 Associate in Arts and Associate in Science degrees;
7 Associate in Applied Science degrees.

Degree productivity was averaged over the preceding five years where possible to allow for year-to-year fluctuation in the number of graduates from a specific program. In accordance with the evaluation policies and procedures, a three-year start-up period was allowed for associate degree programs before they came under evaluation. This allowance was a recognition that a certain amount of time must elapse for students to complete the requirements for a degree, and for a program to develop and gain acceptance.

In the event that any degree program had less than the number of graduates established in the degree productivity criteria, the continuation of the program could be justified if it performed a "service" function. Justification of a program on the basis of "service" was determined from the following FTE student enrollments for regular session:

18 - 22 lower-division FTE students, for Associate in Arts and Associate in Science degree programs;

13 - 17 lower-division FTE students, for Associate in Applied Science degree programs.

As noted in the evaluation guidelines, special consideration was given to low-productivity interdisciplinary programs. These programs consisted of courses which are derived from several different discipline areas.

Degree programs which did not have sufficient productivity to pass the second phase of evaluation, yet which the Department of Community Colleges and the individual colleges wished to continue, required other justification for continuation.

B. Application of the Evaluation Standards in the Context of the Virginia Community College System

Several features of the community college curricula deserve special consideration in the application of the quantitative evaluation standards. One consideration is the relative newness of most community college programs. Less than one-half of all programs, for example, were in existence prior to 1971. The Council evaluation of graduation awards encompassed the five-year period from 1970-71 through 1974-75. The five-year period was selected on the basis of the guideline which states that productivity is to be reviewed for the preceding five years where possible. To ensure that the three-year program start-up period was recognized, programs begun in 1973-74 and 1974-75 were not evaluated on the basis of productivity. Productivity data from the first three years of program existence were included in the averaging process for all programs initiated between 1970-71 and 1972-73.

The evaluation of the community college "service" function for those programs with insufficient degree productivity required careful attention to the program curricula. All A.A. and A.S. degree programs, and some A.A.S. degree programs, are interdisciplinary. This means that these programs have no core discipline upon which to judge the "service" productivity of the program. Consequently, the service function of interdisciplinary programs was measured by the number of full-time-equivalent (FTE) student majors enrolled in those programs during the 1974-75 regular session. This measure was the number of FTE students in a program's "pipeline."

Most Associate in Applied Science degree programs have a core discipline which serves as the focus of the program. The "service" function of these programs was measured by the number of FTE students from all majors served by the core discipline. For example, the service productivity of a Secretarial Science program was determined by the number of FTE students enrolled in courses with a Secretarial Science prefix during the 1974-75 regular session.

C. Procedures

The Council staff worked closely with the staff of the Department of Community Colleges throughout the study. First, the Department of Community Colleges provided the start-up dates for all programs on the current (1975-76) list of approved degree programs. These dates were verified by the individual community colleges. The Department of Community Colleges program codes were used rather than Higher Education General Information Survey (HEGIS) codes so that certificate, diploma, and degree programs could be more readily identified.

Next, the current (1975-76) list of approved degree programs was compared with the list of approved programs for each of the years 1970-71 through 1974-75 in order to:

1. correct for coding changes and discover coding errors over the five-year period;

2. identify programs discontinued during the five-year period (and hence of no further interest for purposes of evaluation); and

3. identify instances in which institutions awarded degrees without authorization.

Once a corrected program list was obtained, the degree output for all programs was tabulated and averaged. To allow adequate time for program start-up, at least a three-year average was used as previously indicated.

Degree programs that failed to meet the minimum standards for degree productivity were flagged for review of their service function during the 1974-75 regular session. Data on service productivity were provided in reports produced by a National Center for Higher Education Management Systems (NCHEMS) instructional workload matrix (IWLM) computer software package. The IWLM identifies (1) enrollments by discipline for each student major, and (2) enrollments by student major for each discipline. The first report, the Consumption Report, supplied the service function data for flagged interdisciplinary programs. The second, the Contribution Report, supplied the service function data for flagged programs which had a core discipline.

In the event that any degree program failed the second phase of the evaluation, the Department of Community Colleges was provided the opportunity to justify the program on other grounds. The Council staff offered to make visits to institutions with members of the staff of the Department of Community Colleges to make assessments of programs on location.

III. Summary

The current (1975-76) approved list of community college degree programs contained 436 programs. Using the degree productivity and service criteria discussed above, the Council staff identified 45 degree programs which required additional justification for their continuation. The Department of Community Colleges has agreed to terminate 12 active programs, and will recommend this action to its Board at its next meeting. After reviewing the justifications of other programs provided by the Department of Community Colleges, the Council staff recommends that five programs be terminated and that five programs be consolidated into two programs. The Council staff recommends that action on one program be deferred until the 1977-78 program review cycle. Twenty-two of the flagged programs have sufficient justification for continuation.

The current list of approved programs includes 25 inactive programs initiated prior to 1973, several of which the State Board for Community Colleges has discontinued recently and the remainder of which are in the process of being discontinued by the State Board for Community Colleges.

IV. Explanation

A. Inactive Programs Initiated Prior to 1973

An inactive program is one to which no resources currently are committed. The State Board for Community Colleges has recently discontinued several of the programs, and the Chancellor has agreed to recommend to the Board that the remainder be discontinued. The inactive programs are listed below for "bookkeeping" purposes to provide a record for future productivity studies:

Institution	Program	Degree	Initiation Date
Blue Ridge	Engineering 831	A.S.	1967
Dabney S. Lancaster	Engineering 831	A.S.	1967
Eastern Shore	Engineering 831	A.S.	1971
	Agricultural Business 302	A.A.S.	1972
Lord Fairfax	Drafting and Design 921	A.A.S.	1970
	Industrial Managemt 963	A.A.S.	1970
Mountain Empire	Construction 917	A.A.S.	1972
New River	Engineering 831	A.S.	1970
Northern Virginia	* Science Technology 829	A.S.	1972
Patrick Henry	* Recreation and Grounds Management 335	A.A.S.	1972
	Production (Furniture) 996	A.A.S.	1972

Institution	Program	Degree	Initiation Date
Piedmont Virginia	* Agricultural Business 302	A.A.S.	1972
	* Mechanical 956	A.A.S.	1972
Rappahannock	Engineering 831	A.S.	1971
Southside Virginia	Automotive 909	A.A.S.	1971
	Engineering 831	A.S.	1970
Southwest Virginia	Agricultural Business 302	A.A.S.	1968
	Civil 915	A.A.S.	1968
	Mechanical 956	A.A.S.	1968
Thomas Nelson	Automotive 909	A.A.S.	1968
	Electromechanical 945	A.A.S.	1972
Tidewater	Insurance 239	A.A.S.	1971
Wytheville	Accounting 203	A.A.S.	1967
	Engineering 831	A.S.	1967
	Industrial 963	A.A.S.	1968

* Programs which were approved for discontinuance by the State Board for Community Colleges at its October 30, 1975, meeting.

B. Active Programs to be Terminated by the Department of Community Colleges

The Department of Community Colleges staff has determined that the following 12 programs are no longer justified, and will recommend to the State Board for Community Colleges that they be discontinued.

Institution	Program	Degree	Initiation Date
Germanna	Engineering 831	A.S.	1970
	Agricultural Business 302	A.A.S.	1971
	Construction 917	A.A.S.	1971
	Merchandising 252	A.A.S.	1971
John Tyler	Chemical 913	A.A.S.	1967
Lord Fairfax	Engineering 831	A.S.	1970
Northern Virginia	Art 504	A.A.	1971
Paul D. Camp	Engineering 831	A.S.	1971
	Mechanical 956	A.A.S.	1971
	Livestock Managemt 189	A.A.S.	1971
Southside Virginia	Merchandising 252	A.A.S.	1970
Virginia Western	Music 505	A.A.	1973

These programs will be phased out as required to permit students already enrolled in a program to complete their degree requirements.

C. Active Programs Recommended for Termination by the Council of Higher Education

After a careful review of the additional justifications for program continuation by the Department of Community Colleges, the Council staff determined that five were inadequate and recommends that these programs be terminated. The recommendations for termination are supported in the following summaries.

PAUL D. CAMP COMMUNITY COLLEGE

Program: Agronomy 305 (A.A.S.)

1. Description of Program: Agronomy is a major under the Agricultural and Natural Resources Technology degree (A.A.S.). The program is designed to prepare individuals in the application of the various soil and plant sciences to soil management and the raising of crops.

2. Background Data

-- Program initiation date: 1971

-- Average annual degree productivity (four-year base): 0.75

-- 1974-75 FTE enrollment in major: 5.84 (a small number of unclassified students is also closely associated with the program)

-- 1974-75 headcount enrollment in major: 11 (a small number of unclassified students is also closely associated with the program)

3. Justification for Termination: The Department of Community Colleges has requested that the program be given one year's grace period, such that if Agronomy did not show significant vitality by Fall Quarter 1976, it would be phased out. However, there is no evidence to support an expectation of increased enrollments during the next year. The service function of the Agronomy program is too low to justify continuation for even a single year.

4. Recommendation: The Council staff recommends that this program be terminated.

PAUL D. CAMP COMMUNITY COLLEGE

Program: Drafting and Design 921 (A.A.S.)

1. Description of Program: Drafting and Design is a major under the Engineering/Industrial Technology degree (A.A.S.). The program is structured for persons who seek employment in the drafting and/or machine design fields, or for those presently employed in drafting who seek advancement.

2. Background Data

-- Program initiation date: 1971

-- Average annual degree productivity (four-year base): 1.25

-- 1974-75 FTE enrollment in major: 10.00 (a very small number of unclassified students is also closely associated with the program)

-- 1974-75 FTE enrollment in Drafting discipline: 10.96

-- 1974-75 headcount enrollment in major: 17 (a very small number of unclassified students is also closely associated with the program)

3. Justification for Termination: The Drafting and Design degree program is complemented by a Drafting certificate program. Both programs have shown low award productivity: the Drafting program has produced only two certificates (in 1972-73), and the Drafting and Design program has produced only five A.A.S. degrees (three in 1973-74 and two in 1974-75). The core discipline (Drafting) for both programs serves only approximately 11 FTE students, below the Council-approved minimum range of 13-17 FTE students. The four-quarter Drafting certificate curriculum overlaps heavily with the six-quarter Drafting and Design degree curriculum. Because many of the students in both programs do not appear to complete the award requirements, the Council staff concludes that most of these students could continue to be served by the certificate program alone.

4. Recommendation: The Council staff recommends that this program be terminated.

PIEDMONT VIRGINIA COMMUNITY COLLEGE

Program: Engineering 831 (A.S.)

1. Description of Program: The Engineering program is designed for persons who plan to transfer to a four-year college or university to complete a baccalaureate degree program in one of the traditional engineering disciplines.

2. Background Data

-- Program initiation date: 1972

-- Average annual degree productivity (three-year base): 0

-- 1974-75 FTE enrollment in major: 8.68

-- 1974-75 headcount enrollment in major: 12

3. Justification for Termination: The Council staff was very sensitive to the fact that the program had been in existence for only three years, and focused its attention upon the service function performed by the program. The Department of Community Colleges notes that the program was initiated at a time when engineering enrollments were declining nationally. The College has observed a slight increase in interest since 1974. It is the College's position that the cost of retaining the Engineering program is minimal because during the first year only one three-quarter sequence is exclusively devoted to Engineering students. The College claims to have exercised restraint in the past in that it has not offered a second year of the Engineering program because of insufficient enrollment, and would plan not to offer the second year until such time as it had enough students ready for the second year to justify the operation of the second year of the program. The Council staff is not convinced that there is sufficient demand for the program to justify its continuation. In effect, the program has never been implemented because the second year of the program is inactive. Without the second year of the Engineering program, the FTE enrollment in the Engineering Technology discipline (the engineering core of the program) represented only 11 percent of the program's curriculum. That is, the Engineering curriculum as now offered is not significantly different than that of the general liberal arts curriculum. It should be noted that even a truncated program offering requires resources. Because an insufficient number of students is served by a program which is essentially inactive, the Council staff recommends termination of the program.

4. Recommendation: The Council staff recommends that this program be terminated.

PIEDMONT VIRGINIA COMMUNITY COLLEGE

Program: Drafting and Design 921 (A.A.S.)

1. Description of Program: Drafting and Design is a major under the Engineering/Industrial Technology degree (A.A.S.). The program is structured for persons who seek employment in the drafting and/or machine design fields, or for those presently employed in drafting who seek advancement.

2. Background Data

-- Program initiation date: 1972

-- Average annual degree productivity (three-year base): 1.0

-- 1974-75 FTE enrollment in major: 11.94

-- 1974-75 FTE enrollment in Drafting discipline: 8.84

-- 1974-75 headcount enrollment in major: 19

3. Justification for Termination: Again, the Council staff was sensitive to the fact that the program had been in existence for only three years, and focused its attention upon the service function performed by the program. The Drafting and Design degree program is complemented by a Drafting certificate program which shows signs of increasing vitality (productivity of one certificate in 1973-74 and three certificates in 1974-75). Last year, Piedmont Virginia Community College recognized that the numbers of students entering the Drafting and Design program was low, and in an effort to economize, redesigned both the Drafting certificate and the Drafting and Design degree program to maximize the efficiency of instruction. Currently, students in both programs enroll in the same drafting courses for the first three quarters. However, there is not sufficient evidence to convince the Council staff that there will be an increase in student demand for the degree program. Because the Drafting certificate program should satisfy much of the demand for training in drafting, the Council staff recommends termination of the Drafting and Design program. If, at a later date, the certificate program appears to have increased significantly in vitality and there is a strong demand for a degree program, the Council staff would encourage a request for such a program.

4. Recommendation: The Council staff recommends that this program be terminated.

SOUTHSIDE VIRGINIA COMMUNITY COLLEGE

Program: Agricultural Business Technology 302 (A.A.S.)

1. Description of Program: Agricultural Business is a major under the Agricultural and Natural Resources Technology degree (A.A.S.). The Agricultural Business program prepares individuals for employment in agricultural business and related fields.

2. Background Data

-- Program initiation date: 1970

-- Average annual degree productivity (five-year base): 1.4

-- 1974-75 FTE enrollment in major: 14.07 (a very small number of unclassified students is also closely associated with the program)

-- 1974-75 FTE enrollment in Agriculture discipline: 3.62

-- 1974-75 headcount enrollment in major: 19 (a very small number of unclassified students is also closely associated with the program)

3. Justification for Termination: The Agricultural Business Technology curriculum is interdisciplinary, although it is heavily business oriented. The curriculum requires that the college offer only one course in agriculture each quarter, and all required business courses are also common to the A.A.S. degree curriculum in Business Management. Degree productivity in the program has been very poor, while the service provided by the program and core discipline (Agriculture) have been marginal. The Department of Community Colleges has not provided any evidence of increased demand for the program in the future. The program could be terminated without reducing service because the Business Management curriculum overlaps heavily. Courses in Agriculture could be offered as options under the Business Management curriculum (similar to the current Accounting and Banking emphases).

4. Recommendation: The Council staff recommends that this program be terminated.

D. Active Programs Recommended for Consolidation

The Council staff concurs with the Department of Community Colleges' recommendation that the following programs be consolidated through a revision of curricula.

BLUE RIDGE COMMUNITY COLLEGE

Program	Degree	Initiation Date
Drafting and Design 921	A.A.S.	1967
Industrial 963	A.A.S.	1967
Mechanical 956	A.A.S.	1967

Recommendation

The Council staff recommends that these programs be consolidated into a new A.A.S. degree program called Mechanical Drafting.

DABNEY S. LANCASTER COMMUNITY COLLEGE

Program	Degree	Initiation Date
Drafting and Design 921	A.A.S.	1967
Mechanical 956	A.A.S.	1971

Recommendation

The Council staff recommends that these programs be consolidated into a new A.A.S. degree program called Mechanical Drafting.

E. Active Program Recommended for Deferred Action

DANVILLE COMMUNITY COLLEGE

Program: Banking and Finance 211 (A.A.S.)

1. Description of Program: Banking and Financial Management is a major under the Business Technology degree (A.A.S.). The program is designed for persons who seek or are already employed in banking and financial occupations. It complements the American Institute of Banking Training programs and was requested by the banking industry for this purpose.

2. Background Data

-- Program initiation date: 1972

-- Average annual degree productivity (three-year base): 0.67

-- 1974-75 FTE enrollment in major: 6.69 (additional unclassified students are closely associated with program)

-- 1974-75 headcount enrollment in major: 13 (additional unclassified students are closely associated with program)

3. Justification for Deferred Action: There are currently nine Banking and Finance programs in the Virginia Community College System. Only the program at Danville is eligible for review during this cycle; the other eight programs will be eligible for review in the next cycle (1977-78). The low service function performed by the Danville program has led the Council staff to question the necessity for a separate business program in Banking and Finance. However, the Council staff would like to be able to review all the Banking and Finance programs together to determine the need for such a program classification.

4. Recommendation: The Council staff recommends that the Council defer action on this program until the 1977-78 review cycle.

012176
mfr

STATE COUNCIL OF HIGHER EDUCATION FOR VIRGINIA

Instructional Programs Advisory Committee

THE QUANTITATIVE EVALUATION OF DEGREE PROGRAMS

Each year the State Council of Higher Education must review a substantial number of requests to plan and initiate new degree programs at Virginia's state colleges and universities. Integral to the review and approval process is the Council's concern that proposed programs should be productive and not unnecessarily duplicative of programs already in operation. To determine the need for proposed and existing programs, the Council usually studies enrollments and degrees conferred throughout Virginia, along with regional and national manpower requirements and training statistics. Existing degree programs will be evaluated by assessing the number of degrees conferred or by reviewing data on student enrollment.

The Council undertakes the quantitative evaluation of degree programs with full awareness that qualitative evaluation of these programs is at least as important. The Council believes, however, that the institutions of higher education themselves bear primary responsibility for the continuous evaluation of the quality of their curricula. Through its quantitative evaluation of degree programs, the Council will help to ensure the accountability of Virginia state-supported institutions of higher education to the citizens of the Commonwealth. Although it is primarily a responsibility of the institutions themselves to ensure that high standards are met by the degree programs they offer, the Council will request the institutions to develop procedures for the qualitative evaluation of degree programs, placing particular emphasis upon graduate programs, but eventually providing for the evaluation of undergraduate and community college programs.

Definition of a Degree Program

To get a proper frame of reference for the evaluation of degree programs by auditing degrees conferred (or program productivity), it is necessary to define a degree program.

For the purpose of evaluation, a degree program is defined as an area of specialization (major) for which recognition is intended to be given by the conferring of a degree. The following factors will be taken into consideration in identifying a degree program:

1. Program Nomenclature: The title by which the area of specialization is identified.

2. Program Classification Code: The code number under which degrees conferred are reported on the U.S.O.E. Higher Education General Information Survey, Form 2300-2.1.

3. Degree Level: The levels of the degree awarded, e.g., Associate's, Bachelor's, Master's, or Doctoral. If a program (major) at any level has several degree title options, such as MA, MS, MAT, the number of degrees are recorded in the aggregate as reported under the program classification code.

For example, a major in Biology (general) may have several master's degree options such as MA, MS, MAT, and MEd. Each option, however, should have the program classification code of 0401: Biology, general. All degrees conferred in that major would be reported on the Higher Education General Information Survey (HEGIS) of the U.S. Office of Education. The Council would review degree productivity by using O E Form 2300-2.1: Degrees and Other Formal Awards Conferred, Page 8, Line 53.

Degree Productivity Criteria

The first step in the evaluation of a degree program productivity should be its record of graduates. This will be determined by the tabulation of degrees conferred each year and the average per year over a period of several years. The measure of degrees conferred will take three factors into consideration: program start-up time, annual productivity expectations, and long-term productivity.

1. Allowance will be made for program start-up time. The Council recognizes that a certain amount of time must elapse for students to complete the requirements for a degree, and for a program to develop and gain acceptance. This time span varies according to degree level, program naiure, and whether the students are part-time or full-time. The following allowances will be made before programs come under evaluation.

   - 3 years for Associate degrees;
   - 3 years for Bachelor's degrees;
   - 2 years for Master's degrees;
   - 4 years for Doctoral degrees.

At the end of each time period, the State Council of Higher Education will begin to monitor program degree productivity.

2. According to program level, a certain minimum annual average number of graduates will be expected. These numbers are:

- 10 Associate in Arts and Associate in Science degrees;
- 7 Associate in Applied Science degrees;
- 5 Bachelor's degrees;
- 3 Master's degrees;
- 2 Doctoral degrees.

Productivity will be reviewed each biennium, covering the preceding five years where possible. The five year average will be used to allow for year-to-year fluctuation in the number of graduates from a specific program.

Service Criteria

In the event that any degree program has less than the number of graduates established in the degree productivity criteria, the staff of the State Council of Higher Education will consult with institutional officers regarding other justifications for continuation of the program. Should an institution wish to continue a program, despite few graduates, it will be provided the opportunity to justify such a program by showing a "service" function from data reported on the Council Form A-1: Resident Classes Taught by Term.

1. Justification of a program on the basis of "service" would be determined from the Full-Time-Equivalent Student (FTES) enrollment for regular session, or summer session under special circumstances.

- 18-22 lower-division FTES, for Associate in Arts and Associate in Science degree programs;

- 13-17 lower-division FTES, for Associate in Applied Science degree programs;

- 10-14 upper-division FTES, for Bachelor's degree programs;

- 8-12 first-year graduate FTES, for Master's degree programs.

2. In the event that any Doctoral degree program has less than the number of graduates established in the numerical criteria, an institution might propose a justification of the program on the basis of organized and sponsored research projects underway.

3. A non-productive Master's degree program which is carried along with a Doctoral program, may be "flagged," or removed from the list of non-productive programs. In this case, the productivity criterion will not be applied. However, at the same time then, the Council will remove that program from the inventory used in preparing the biennial budget for library holdings.

4. The Council will give special consideration to low-productivity interdisciplinary programs, which are composed of courses from other disciplinary programs rather than new courses.

Procedure

The biennial program evaluation will be initiated by the staff of the State Council of Higher Education and be conducted in the following manner:

1. Composite tables of degrees conferred will be prepared from previously verified data and each institution's report of Degrees Conferred (O.E. 2300-2.1):

   - by degree level;
   - by program classification code and nomenclature with cross-check on each institution's inventory of approved programs.

2. Draft tables will be sent to each institution for vertification of new data and comment on any discrepancies or irregularities. Council staff will confer with institutional administrators on any problems that might be identified.

3. A questionnaire will be sent to the appropriate institutional administrative officer for any degree program that fails to meet the established degree productivity criteria. Other factors that ought to be considered should be identified at this time.

4. Council staff will consult with institutional administrative officers on the questionnaire responses and the action to be taken on each program in question.

5. Council staff will report the evaluation results to the State Council of Higher Education for Virginia for its information or recommended action; e.g., continuation, probation, termination with adequate phase-out time.

6. An institution will be given the opportunity to appeal a Council decision under the same conditions as prescribed in the Council's Policy and Procedures for the Approval of New Degree Programs.